

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**Pre-U Certificate**

[www.XtremePapers.com](http://www.XtremePapers.com)

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series**

### **9774 PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

**9774/03**

Paper 3 (Topics and Key Texts in Philosophy and Theology 2), maximum raw mark 50

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

|        |                       |          |       |
|--------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme           | Syllabus | Paper |
|        | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9774     | 03    |

## Topic 1 Philosophy of Mind

### Section A

[Extract from **John Searle**: *Minds, Brains & Science*: 86–87]

- 1 (a) (i) **Searle talks about the “question of freedom and determinism”. Outline what he means by this.**
- (ii) **Explain why both determinism and indeterminism, according to Searle, allow no room for freedom of the will.**

The question of freedom and determinism is another issue for which philosophers seek understanding / reconciliation in the same way that they seek understanding / reconciliation for the question of mind and brain. The question of freedom and determinism involves a number of related questions, including that of whether or not the physical processes of the universe are causally determined in their entirety.

Since nature consists of particles and their relations with each other, and since everything can be accounted for and determined in terms of those particles and their relations, there is simply no room for freedom of the will. Indeterminism at the level of particles in physics offers no support for freedom of the will, since indeterminacy at the particle level does not demonstrate indeterminacy at the level of the objects that matter to us. Moreover even if we say that there is an element of indeterminacy in the behaviour of particles – even if they are only statistically predictable – it is not at all obvious that the mind can force the statistically-determined particles to swerve from their paths. Everything we know about physics forces us to some form of denial of human freedom. The strongest image for conveying the conception of determinism is that given by Laplace: if an ideal observer knew the positions of all the particles at a given instant, he could predict and retrodict the entire history of the universe. As a counterbalance, it is a fact that humans have an innate feeling that their choices are free. **[10]**

- (b) **Examine critically Searle’s view that compatibilism does not really solve the problem of freedom of the will.**

The standard solution to the philosophical conundrum of freedom and determinism is that these two are compatible. All actions are determined, but to say that they are also free is to say that they are not constrained: we are not forced to do them. According to Searle, this notion is vacuous, since that which is determined cannot involve any real measure of freedom: the so-called inner psychological causes which compatibilism takes as a measure of freedom are themselves determined, so that whatever choices we make, we could not, in fact, have chosen otherwise. The problem of compatibilism is, then, that it doesn’t answer the question. ‘Could we have done otherwise, all other conditions remaining the same?’, in a way that is consistent with our belief in our own free will. Compatibilism denies the substance of free will while maintaining its verbal shell. Common sense, however, tells us that we know the difference between somebody operating under post-hypnotic suggestion (in which there is no free will) and somebody operating normally, so our sense of being free seems to us to be justified. Nevertheless that sense of freedom is not grounded in any physical reality. For some reason nature/evolution has given us a form of experience of voluntary action where the sense of freedom (i.e. the sense of alternative possibilities) is built into the structure of conscious, voluntary, intentional human behaviour, so nothing is going to convince us that our will is unfree, even though it is not. Compatibilism, then, is the product of this act of evolution. **[15]**

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 3</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9774</b>     | <b>03</b>    |

## Section B

### 2 Evaluate Cartesian substance dualism as a theory of mind.

Candidates are likely to begin with a definition of CSD, i.e. that persons are to be identified with an incorporeal soul. Soul is a logical substance possessing none of the attributes of physical substance, such as divisibility and extension in space. Whereas physical substance can change and decay, soul substance cannot, so remains incorruptible and immortal. The soul is a thinking thing, since 'I am not my body: 'I am a thing that thinks. Descartes has a number of arguments, so candidates might refer, for example, to the argument from doubt, the argument from clear and distinct perception, and the argument from divisibility. CSD is generally unpopular because of its lack of explanatory power. CSD has no coherent explanation of the undoubted existence of consciousness in animals; the brain seems redundant, since all mental functions are the province of the soul; and Descartes could offer no coherent explanation of the interaction between the physical brain and the non-physical soul. Some might mention the problem of counting souls, the homunculus fallacy, and so on. [25]

OR

### 3 Critically assess the claim that there is no satisfactory solution to the hard problem of consciousness.

The various formulations of this include, for example: the problem of why consciousness should give rise to an inner mental life / the problem of why qualia exist / the question of why we are not philosophical zombies / the issue of how some biological organisms are subjects of experience / the question that: where experience is clearly associated with a variety of physical functions, why are those functions associated with particular mental states and not others? Candidates may take any line they wish: some might argue that some form of reductive account, despite the problems associated with such accounts, explains consciousness since reductive physicalism begs fewer questions than non-reductive accounts of the mind. Others may pursue the opposite line, that reductive accounts of mind have no convincing explanation whatever for consciousness. Some might argue that the question cannot even be formulated in the right terms, since we do not know what to ask; others that the question is still a chimera, since we have absolutely no idea how consciousness is generated, and we cannot even show that it is generated by the brain. Where Roger Penrose suggested that consciousness is associated with quantum coherence in the microtubules of the brain, Patricia Smith Churchland commented that an equally probable explanation was pixie dust in the synapses. [25]

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 4</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9774</b>     | <b>03</b>    |

## Topic 2 Ethics

4 (a) [Extract from **John-Paul Sartre**: *Existentialism and Humanism* page: 27–28]

**With reference to the passage above, examine the key features of Jean Paul Sartre’s existentialism.**

Candidates should identify the following key points: this is an illustration of what is meant by atheistic existentialism. Sartre has identified that there is confusion since some religious believers claim to be existentialists and here seeks to clarify what it means to be an atheist existentialist. In addition he identifies what he sees as an inconsistency within eighteenth century atheism – he believes that rejection of belief in God must be accompanied by a rejection of the belief that essence precedes existence. Basic assumption is that God does not exist and is not therefore the artisan of human nature, and that there is no universal definition of what it is to be a human being. Human existence precedes essence. There is no universal human nature with ‘fundamental qualities’; there is just the reality of being alive, free to be the artisan of one’s own life. **[10]**

**(b) Examine Sartre’s claim that whether God exists or not is irrelevant to existentialism.**

Candidates may know that Sartre made this claim in the closing comments of the lecture. Critical engagement may include a wide variety of responses and all relevant responses are to be fully credited. Some may reflect upon whether the assumption of atheism, in the absence of engagement with evidence or argument, is satisfactory. Different kinds of atheism may be outlined with Sartre defined as volitional or practical atheism. The nature of Sartre’s objection to God is the claim that human freedom would be compromised to such an extent that a human being would no longer be able to authenticate his/her existence. This may be evaluated. The question of Sartre’s reasoning may also be examined. He appears to commit the logical fallacy of Appeal to Consequences (argumentum ad consequentiam) in which the disagreeable consequences of holding a particular belief are used to show the belief to be false, when the disagreeable consequences have no logical bearing on the truth-claim. Others may reflect generally upon whether belief in God does make a difference or more specifically engage with the work of religious existentialist philosophies, such as Situation Ethics, in which the existence of God is said to make a difference. The question ‘make a difference to what?’ may be engaged with. **[15]**

|        |                       |          |       |
|--------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme           | Syllabus | Paper |
|        | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9774     | 03    |

## Section B

- 5 'The Bible contributes nothing to modern ethical debates.' Evaluate this claim with particular reference to the Sermon on the Mount and Paul's Letter to the Romans.

A range of responses are anticipated but high levels can only be awarded to those who demonstrate knowledge of the Sermon on the Mount and Romans. The distinctive features of Christian ethics are expected, including the demand for love of neighbour and absolute forgiveness. Some may argue that it is not the Bible which is critical in modern decision making but the spiritual life of commitment. A balanced argument is required with acknowledgement of both the limits and the wisdom of the Biblical texts when applied to selected ethics issues. [25]

OR

- 6 Examine which ethical theory is best equipped to deal with the issue of war and peace

Candidates have numerous options open to them and scripts will be marked according to level of response. Knowledge of just war theory is expected with high level scripts also demonstrating a mature level of engagement with the issues through use of practical examples. Knowledge of *ius ad bellum*: the appropriate conditions for entering into war, and *ius in bello*: the appropriate way to fight a war will usually be dealt with and some may have knowledge of the long tradition, stemming from the Roman doctrine of *justum bellum* (first articulated by Cicero), and Old Testament stories of wars fought on Israel's behalf. The adoption of just war theory into Christian ethics by Augustine, in which fighting on behalf of the Roman Empire was considered acceptable, may be included as part of a reflection on Christian ethics. For higher levels the focus of the essay should be on the application of ethical theories. [25]

|        |                       |          |       |
|--------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme           | Syllabus | Paper |
|        | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9774     | 03    |

### Topic 3 Old Testament Prophecy:

[Extract **Amos 8: 1 – 6** A basket of summer fruit.]

#### 7 (a) Examine the content and meaning of the passage above.

**V1–3 A basket of summer fruit:** This was fruit that was *ripe*, and would not keep long. Just as the time is short for **summer fruit**, so the time is short for Israel.

In the original Hebrew, the prophet's point is far more emphatic because of the play on words [between **summer** and **end**] . . . The point of this vision, then, is the finality of judgment. The implication is that the dead bodies of the people will be thrown out in silence, just like rotten fruit. V4-6 social injustice in Israel is listed: dishonesty and the cheating of the poor, dishonesty in business where the scale is falsely weighed to give less food for more money. Religious festivals are *kept*, the **New Moon** and **Sabbath**, but they could not wait until they were over so that they could get back to trading. Students may cross reference with other texts in Amos and make observations which demonstrate their knowledge of the social and historical context. **[10]**

#### (b) 'The prophets were only concerned with proclaiming doom.'

**Examine how far this is true.**

Candidates have a very wide range of options for this question and may consider any of the prophets listed on the specification. For the full range of marks both salvation and hope will need to be considered. Candidates should be able to show the general nature of the doom oracle. Accept examples from throughout the prophetic period. The doom oracle has the general structure of: *Thus says Yahweh / reason for the complaint / sometimes a contrast with Yahweh's previous acts on behalf of (Israel) contrasted with current behaviour / pronouncement of doom/destruction / concluding formula: Oracle of Yahweh*. This structure is widespread, and suggests that it is the typical formula used to convey the prophetic word to its recipients. It is far more prevalent than the form of the salvation oracle, and Jeremiah presumes that all prophecy up to his own era was based on announcements of doom, since promises of salvation are typically false.

Candidates may show that the prophets used several techniques in order to convey their message: e.g. speeches, poems, symbolic acts, miracles, etc., and they should be able to show the importance of those they refer to in the service of the question. **[15]**

#### 8 Discuss how prophetic writings were collected and preserved.

The standard view is that in the early period, oracles were collected by disciples of the prophets, e.g. in the case of prophets like Elijah & Samuel, the 'sons of the prophets' who were their followers in the prophetic guilds. The preservation of these would initially have been through oral tradition, where the words of the cult leader would have been remembered and transmitted, as shown in the narratives in the Books of Kings. The writing down of these traditions would have been through editorial / redactive activity. In the case of the writing prophets, the role of oral tradition would have been equally formative through the disciples of the prophets e.g. Isaiah 8:16; Jer. 26 & 36. Many scholars argue that all prophets had cultic associations (e.g. Amos at Bethel), and claim that the collection of oracles would have been within a cultic context as well as through more personal channels (for example, the relationship between Jeremiah and Baruch). Reference may also be made to the role of editorial and redactive activity, for example in connection with the Book of the Twelve, where it is a matter of some debate as to whether the salvation oracles are echoes of the original words of the prophets or are an intrusive

|               |                              |                 |              |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 7</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>           | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>Pre-U – May/June 2013</b> | <b>9774</b>     | <b>03</b>    |

development. It is possible that some of the writing prophets, e.g. Isaiah & Jeremiah, lived long enough to foresee a need to commit their oracles to writing, although the editing task presumably devolved upon the prophet's disciples. Some may discuss canonical issues e.g. the comparison between the Massoretic text of the Book of Jeremiah and the shorter, and apparently more reliable text of the LXX translation, which seems to reflect a more accurate Hebrew original. [25]

**OR**

**9 Critically examine the influence of the call of Isaiah of Jerusalem on his work and message.**

Important elements in the call story might include:

- timing: an effective Davidic king had died, leaving no adequate heir – a void which God was expected to fill
- the theophany in the Temple: Isaiah had an experience of the real presence of Yahweh, persuading him of the holiness of the Temple, and, by extension, of Jerusalem
- this reinforces the then-current Jerusalem theology linked to the Davidic dynasty / its application by Isaiah
- the theophany brings a conviction of the holiness, power and universal sovereignty of Yahweh, as well as a knowledge of his ultimate kingship over Israel: how this was used in Isaiah's message, and in relation to the Davidic king
- the call itself giving Isaiah authority and confidence
- the suggestion in the call that the message will not be accepted, so the nation is moving towards disaster: helps Isaiah to accept rejection and to look beyond, to the messianic age.

A common treatment will probably be to discuss the effect of the call on Isaiah's treatment of the historical situation. Since most of the above themes arguably have historical application in terms of Isaiah's involvement in the Assyrian crisis, his comments on Egyptian alliances, and so on, candidates are likely to arrive at the conclusion that his call was critical, however others may argue that the historical circumstances of his call were what influenced his understanding of his call. Accept any reasoning offered by candidates as credit-worthy, whatever conclusion is reached.